



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

This first part is supplied with a threefold index. A few maps would greatly increase its value.

DANA C. MUNRO.

The History of England from the Accession of Henry III. to the Death of Edward III., 1216-1377. By T. F. TOUT, M.A., Professor of Medieval and Modern History in the University of Manchester. [*The Political History of England*, edited by WILLIAM HUNT, D. Litt., and REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A. Volume III.] (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Pp. xxiv, 496.)

PROFESSOR TOUT contributes the third of the volumes of the *Political History of England*. It goes without saying that the uniformly high standard of this series suffers nothing at the hands of Professor Tout. In some respects, in a freshness and newness of viewpoint, the volume has an advantage over its predecessors. For this, however, the author must share the credit with the peculiar opportunity offered by the field assigned him. This part of English history has been somewhat neglected by English historians of the last generation. To understand how much, one has only to recount the imposing monographs which have appeared upon the earlier or later periods and compare them with the somewhat meagre array of modern English authorities which the bibliography offers, especially for the part which precedes the reign of Edward III. If, however, English scholars have neglected this period, foreign scholars, particularly the French, have not. A vast array of continental sources has been made accessible, to say nothing of the many and valuable researches of French scholars that have given new importance to events which English writers have been in the habit of passing over altogether or leaving somewhat in the obscurity of background. Professor Tout has put the most of this material under tribute.

It is not possible, however, in the space allotted to this review to do more than note some of the more interesting modifications of accepted views. Thus the Pope appears as the real successor of William Marshal (p. 17). His policy is not to crush English liberty, but to prevent "Englishmen from flying at each other's throats" (p. 18). Something, moreover, is to be said even for Eleanor's uncles (pp. 54, 57). They were by no means such a bad lot as Matthew of Paris would have us believe. Again, in the troubles of the next reign Boniface was not unfriendly to Edward nor had he any idea of quarrelling with either Edward or Philip. No one was more surprised than he, apparently, that his unfortunate *Clericis laicos* should have raised such a disturbance (p. 200).

The author follows Bémont in finding a place for that disembodied ghost, the so-called *Statutum de tallagio non concedendo* (cf. p. 208 with Bémont, *Chartes des Libertés Anglaises*, pp. xliii, xliv, and 87). He also shows a masterly comprehension of Edward's policy (pp. 138

and 139), but does not believe that Edward deserves the credit for the peace which prevailed within England during his later years so much as Boniface's unfortunate attempt at intervention in the Scottish affair and the lucky escheat of some of the great baronies (pp. 216-224).

In the struggles of Edward II.'s reign the author sees more of personal rancor and shameless self-seeking on the part of noble-born politicians than of any comprehensive or far-sighted grasp of constitutional principles. In this he will be supported by most scholars, yet we would like to question the statement (p. 243) that the complete "ignoring of the commons" in 1310 was not due to "aristocratic jealousy". If not jealousy, surely contempt, and the two are so closely allied that it is hard to distinguish sometimes. Other statements also may be challenged. Justice is not done to the contracting parties in calling the indemnity offered to Prince Louis in 1217 "a bribe" (p. 13). Nor can the reissue of the charter of the same date be called "its final form"—even "substantially" (*ibid.*). It is assigning too much importance to Henry's council of regency to say that from this council arose the *idea of limited monarchy* (p. 29). The suggestion (pp. 116, 117) that Earl Simon deliberately sacrificed the men of London to the necessities of his plan of battle at Lewes hardly does justice to Simon, nor is it consistent with later estimates of his character. On the other hand, the introduction of the popular element in the famous Parliament of 1265 seems to have been an afterthought on Simon's part and due rather to his necessities than to any "boldness and largeness of his spirit" (p. 120). It is difficult to see how the passage of the Severn at Kempsey (p. 126) reveals Simon's skill when the withdrawal of Edward from Worcester made the passage possible. The skilful strategist and tactician of the Evesham campaign is not Simon but Edward. Again, the great custom of 1275 was more than an expedient to raise revenue. It was substituted not so much for the old land-tax as for the irregular levies of prise (p. 148). The date 1279 is a little early to speak of Parliament as "the estates" (p. 151). It is scarcely more accurate to say that Parliament "passed" a statute at a time when the legislative function of Parliament was still confined to the "humble petition" (*ibid.*). The statement (p. 152) that "all medieval laws were rather enunciations of an ideal than measures which practical statesmen aimed at carrying out in detail", can scarcely be meant to be taken seriously. Louis X.'s posthumous child was a son not a daughter (p. 295). The character of Edward III. is somewhat overdrawn. At all events one could hardly style him a "fluent and eloquent speaker in . . . English" (pp. 310, 312). The possession of Berwick by the English, after Halidon Hill, was in no sense "final" (p. 320). The statement that the death of the elder Artevelt marked "the end of the Anglo-Flemish alliance" should at least be qualified (p. 349). One hesitates to accuse the author of not having read the Statute of Laborers. But he certainly could not have read carefully or at least recently when he made the statement (p. 373): "The statute provided

that prices, like wages, should remain as they had been before the pestilence." It is, moreover, difficult to understand how the employers suffered more than the laborers under the statute.

The book is not without traces here and there of careless writing. Thus on page 3 the somewhat startling statement is made that "the dead king had lately shown . . . rare energy". So Isabella, the wife of Edward II., is described (p. 292) as "a woman of strong character . . . with [a] lack of morals and scruples". Other instances might be cited which fall under lapses of taste. It certainly does not do Bruce justice to call him a "clever adventurer" (p. 262), or Owen Tudor, a "traitor" (p. 414).

It is unfortunate that the plans of the editors do not allow more space for foot-notes in this excellent series. It is not only that the author frequently needs the foot-note to justify his position, but to satisfy the reader that he is getting the result of scholarly care and is not being led astray by the vagary of the author or the carelessness of the proof-reader. Note, for example, in the present work the group of dates connected with the series of brilliant exploits of the Scots of the years 1312-1315, where there is considerable divergence from the ordinary dates. So too one should like to know if the author has anything more than the questionable authority of Villani to support his "three small cannon" which Edward "dragged about" with him in his Crécy campaign (p. 364). So also in the light of the somewhat extensive literature upon the Black Death and the widely divergent views of creditable authors, the simple assertion that this dreaded pestilence was the bubonic plague (p. 370) is hardly sufficient. Still more to the point is the account of the battle of Poitiers. Here the author quite justly rejects Froissart and follows le Baker, yet not altogether, since his narrative is also influenced by Chandos Herald, particularly in his efforts to trace the movements of the two armies. But Chandos Herald, as well as Froissart, especially since the publication in 1899 of Denifle's *Désolation des Églises*, has also fallen under disfavor. In a note added to the appendix the author promises to justify his narrative later. It is to be hoped that this may be done, but there are a lot of other statements that one would also like to see justified or at least supported by foot-notes for the guidance of the student.

The book is accompanied by the customary bibliography and also by three useful maps.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

La Foi Religieuse en Italie au Quatorzième Siècle. Par CHARLES DEJOB. (Paris: A. Fontemoing. 1906. Pp. 439.)

THE thesis which Professor Dejob maintains in the book under consideration is that, contrary to the general impression disseminated by writers like Burckhardt and Voigt, the fourteenth century in Italy was one of profound and simple faith, of sincere attachment to pope, clergy, and monastic orders. The critics who have argued from the